



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,326	12/31/2001	Yukio Sawajiri	SAWAJIRI=2	4583

1444 7590 03/16/2005

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER

LUGO, CARLOS

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3676

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/032,326

Applicant(s)

SAWAJIRI ET AL.

Examiner

Carlos Lugo

Art Unit

3676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on February 16, 2005. The finality of the last Office Action is withdrawn and a new Office action has been made in order to correct some informality regarding the claim language and the drawings that were not previously presented during the prosecution.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the longitudinal axis of the metal base and the front connecting part, as claimed in claim 1, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description:
 - Element 17 is not described in the specification.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner

Art Unit: 3676

does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. **Claims 1 and 6 are objected** to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 1 Line 4, change "plate-like" to -plate-.
- Claim 1 Line 5, add -the metal base defines a longitudinal axis- after "body".
- Claim 1 Line 10, add -each leg part defines longitudinal length and the front connecting part defines a longitudinal axis- after "leg part".
- Claim 6 Lines 2 and 3, change "wherein said second leg part has the same shape as said first leg part, and said" to -wherein said- since that limitation was already claimed in claim 2 and claim 6 is depending from it.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-10 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 6,155,618 to Ichinose in view of GB Pat No 2,336,178 to Mark and further in view of US Pat No 6,042,160 to Hamada et al (Hamada).

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Ichinose discloses a striker comprising a longitudinal plate metal base (4) fixed to a vehicle body and defining a longitudinal axis and an U-shaped metal engaging member (5).

The engaging member includes a first leg part (5A), a second leg part (5B), parallel to the first leg part, and a front connecting part (5C), which connects a front end of the first leg part with a front end of the second leg part. The leg parts define longitudinal lengths and the front connecting part defines a longitudinal axis.

The longitudinal axis of the front connecting part is perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the metal base. The longitudinal lengths of the leg parts are perpendicular to the plane of the metal base.

Each leg part has a rear end which projects on a rear side of the base through a mounting hole on the base (Figures 6 and 7). Front and rear caulking flange have a larger diameter than the diameter of the mounting hole so as to engage a front and a rear side of the base respectively (Figures 6 and 7).

The first leg part has, at a front side portion, a latch engaging part, which is engageable with a latch on the vehicle door latch device (10).

However, Ichinose fails to disclose that at the rear side portion of the front leg part, the leg part has a reinforcing large diameter part that has a larger diameter than the one defined at the latch engaging part and that the latch has a recess that engage the latch engaging part.

Mark teaches that it is well known in the art to have a striker (10) that has first and second legs parts, wherein the leg parts (18 and 20), at the rear side portion, defines a reinforcing large diameter part (Figures 1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a reinforcing large diameter part, as taught by Mark, into a device as described by Ichinose, in order to give more strength to the striker and to increase the durability of the striker.

As to the fact that the latch has a recess that engages the latch engaging part of the first leg part, Ichinose discloses the connection between a latch and the striker. Ichinose does not illustrate or discloses that the latch has a recess that engages the first leg. Although it is obvious that the latch (10) presented by Ichinose has a recess that receive the leg part of the striker, Hamada is provided to confirm and to teach that it is well known in the art to have a latch member (14) that has a recess that engages a leg part of a striker. Therefore, it is obvious to have a latch with a recess that engages a striker leg part.

As to claim 3, Ichinose illustrates that the latch engaging part has the same diameter as the front connecting part.

As to claim 4, Ichinose, as modified by Mark, discloses that between the reinforcing large diameter part and the latch engaging part is disposed a tapered part.

Art Unit: 3676

As to claims 5,7 and 8, Ichinose, as modified by Mark, illustrates that the length of the reinforced large diameter part is 25% or more of the length of the first leg part.

As to claim 6, Ichinose, as modified by Mark, illustrates that the latch engaging part has the same diameter as the front connecting part and that between the reinforcing large diameter part and the latch engaging part is disposed a tapered part.

As to claims 9 and 10, Ichinose, as modified by Mark, discloses that the reinforced large diameter part has a length of twice or more the length of the rear caulking flange, in the longitudinal direction of the first leg part.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on February 16, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, in order to correct some informality regarding the claim language and the drawings that were not previously presented during the prosecution, a new Office Action is presented.

And second, as to the applicant's arguments regarding the rejection to the claims in view of Ichinose, as modified by Mark and Hamada, the arguments are not persuasive and the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlos Lugo whose telephone number is 703-305-

Art Unit: 3676

9747 or 571-272-7058 (after March 31, 2005). The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on 703-308-2686. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5771.

C.L.

Carlos Lugo
AU 3676

March 9, 2005.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Daniel P. Stodola". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "D".

DANIEL P. STODOLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600